

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, 38-50, and 52-59 are presently pending, of which claims 1, 30, and 44 are independent. In the Office Action, claims 1, 3-10, 12-36, and 52-59 were rejected. Applicants believe that the claims are patentable and in condition for allowance as discussed below. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the comments set forth below.

Applicants thank the Examiner for withdrawing the objection to claim 56 (Office Action at page 24).

**I. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)**

In the Office Action at page 2, third paragraph, claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, 30-33, 36, 42-47, 50, and 56-69 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0001896 to Johnson (hereafter “Johnson”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

**A. Claims 1, 3-6, 25, 28, and 56**

Independent claim 1 recites:

1. A computer readable storage medium storing computer executable instructions that when executed on a processor manage a graphical interface, the medium storing:

instructions for providing a graphical interface, a hardware device and a software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the software device being accessible to a computer;

instructions for providing at least one interactive hardware object accessible to the computer, where the hardware object represents the hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, the hardware object interacting with the hardware device;

instructions for providing a software object, wherein the software object is representative of the software device, where the software object is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device;

*instructions for receiving, from a user, a plurality of configurations of the hardware device, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object; and*

*instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device.*

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson fails to disclose at least *instructions for receiving, from a user, a plurality of configurations of the hardware device, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object*, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, Johnson does not allow a user to specify more than one configuration for a single hardware device.

The Examiner asserts that Johnson discloses this feature of claim 1 at Figure 26 and paragraph [0138] (Office Action at page 4, first complete paragraph). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Paragraph [0138] discloses that a user may specify parameters such as an input range, sensitivity, or resonant frequency for selected channels. A user may choose these values only to establish a single configuration for a measurement device. That is, after a user has established values for the parameters in paragraph [0138] (or in the device settings panel depicted in Figure 26), the measurement task specifier 730 analyzes those parameters to generate a measurement task specification (Johnson at paragraph [0143]). The measurement task specification 740 is used to produce a run-time specification 770 (Johnson at paragraphs [0102]-[0105]). The run-time builder then provides the user-specified parameters to the devices to specify the configuration of the devices for the measurement task (Johnson at paragraph [0103]). As shown in Johnson at Figures 24-27, the dialog boxes used in the configuration process contain only enough user-inputs to establish a single configuration for each device. In contrast, claim 1 requires *instructions for receiving, from a user, a plurality of configurations of the hardware device*. Johnson does not disclose a plurality of configurations of the hardware device.

It appears that the Examiner may be confusing providing a single configuration for each of multiple devices, as is done in Johnson, with providing a plurality of configurations for a single device, as is done in claim 1. For example, the Examiner argues, in response to Applicants' arguments, that Johnson allows a user to configure multiple devices. ("Response to Arguments" at pages 24-27 of the Office Action). However, claim 1 does not recite

“configuring multiple devices;” rather, claim 1 recites *receiving a plurality of configurations of the hardware device.*

While Johnson may allow multiple devices to be configured, Johnson does not allow a plurality of configurations for a single device. Claim 1 recites *a plurality of configurations of the hardware device*, i.e., a single hardware device, and not a configuration for a plurality of hardware devices. Whether Johnson can configure multiple devices is moot, because claim 1 does not recite configuring multiple devices. Instead, claim 1 includes multiple configurations for a single device.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson also fails to disclose *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, as recited in claim 1. The Examiner asserts that Johnson discloses this feature of claim 1 at Figure 26 and paragraph [0138] (Office Action at page 4, last paragraph). However, as noted above, the cited passages of Johnson do not disclose a plurality of configurations.

The Examiner also asserts that “Johnson Figures 28A-G and 29 show a single graphical interface displaying [a] configuration of a plurality of hardware and software objects” (Office Action at page 26, third paragraph).

However, as noted above, claim 1 does not recite displaying a configuration of a plurality of hardware and software objects. Instead, claim 1 recites *displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*. In claim 1, the unique hardware objects each represent the hardware device. That is, each of a plurality of configurations corresponds to a hardware object, and each hardware object represents the (single) hardware device. Accordingly, Johnson does not disclose *displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, wherein each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, as recited in claim 1.

For at least the reasons identified above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 depend from independent claim 1 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 1. Accordingly, claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 3-6, 25, 28, and 56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**B. Claims 30-33, 36, 42-43, and 57**

Independent claim 30 recites:

30. A method for managing an interface, the method comprising:
  - providing a graphical interface, a hardware device and a software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the software device being accessible to a computer;
  - providing at least one hardware object accessible to the computer, where the hardware object represents the hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, the hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;
  - providing at least one software object, representative of the software device, where the software object is depicted in the graphical interface, and is configured to be interactive with the software device and;  
*the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object;* and
  - displaying the hardware object and the software object to a user.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30.

The Examiner asserts that “Johnson teaches configuring measurement devices. Measurement devices inherently display changes in the device (i.e. monitoring conditions)” (Office Action at page 26, second paragraph). Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner misconstrues claim 30.

For example, the Examiner states, at page 26:

Measurement devices inherently display changes in the device (i.e., monitoring conditions). Johnson explicitly teaches this type of behavior in paragraph [0113], “*determine a set of hardware, hardware connections, hardware settings, and software configuration that can maintain a level in a tank (whose simulated linear model is specified to be M) by monitoring the present value of the tank level and valve position on an HMI*”.

The Examiner further states that Johnson discloses the above-quoted feature of claim 30 at paragraph [0242] and Figure 26 (Office Action at page 7, last paragraph). Applicants respectfully disagree.

As noted above, Figure 26 and paragraph [0242] discuss the Device Settings Panel of Johnson, which allows a user to specify the settings of a device. This panel is not ***updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object***, as required by claim 30. Rather, the panel is updated based on user input indicated that a particular parameter should be set in the hardware device (Johnson at paragraph [0242]). At the time that the panel is updated, the underlying hardware object or software object has not yet been changed. Because the underlying hardware object or software object has not been changed at the time that the cited GUI is updated in Johnson, Johnson cannot be updating the GUI ***in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object***, as recited in claim 30.

As to the Examiner’s inherency argument, Applicants note that claim 30 recites that the graphical interface is updated in claim 30. As recited in claim 30, the graphical interface also has a hardware device and a software device accessible to it, and depicts the hardware object and the software object. The Examiner’s example of a measurement device’s GUI would not include the cited hardware and software objects representing hardware and software devices, respectively.

For at least the reasons stated above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 30 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 depend from independent claim 30 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 30. Accordingly claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, 57 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 30.

Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 31-33, 36, 42-43, and 57 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

**C. Claims 44-47, 50, and 58**

Independent claim 44 recites:

44. A computing device comprising:  
a storage medium for storing and a processor for processing;  
a graphical interface, at least one hardware device and one software device being accessible through the graphical interface;  
a plurality of hardware objects accessible to the computer, where each of the hardware objects represents a hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, each hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;  
a plurality of software objects, each representative of a software device accessible to the computer, where each of the software objects is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device; and  
*a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously.*

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose *a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*, which is present in claim 44. In Johnson, all three elements (the plurality of hardware objects, the plurality of software objects, and at least one configuration) are not displayed simultaneously in a single graphical interface. At least one element is missing from each interface in Johnson.

The Examiner asserts that Johnson discloses the above-quoted feature of claim 44 in Figures 28A-G and 29 (Office Action at page 26, last paragraph). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Figures 28A-G depict code generation from a measurement task specification (Johnson at paragraph [0253]). None of Figures 28A-G depict a configuration displayed with a plurality of hardware and software objects.

Figure 29 depicts a complex measurement task, in which the task involves measuring, for example, “both the temperature and pressure” (Johnson at paragraph [0266]). Figure 29 shows “the particular measurement (type) currently being configured” (Johnson at paragraph [0266]). Figure 29 depicts a measurement task (which is not a device) and a single configuration for the measurement task.

Figure 29 does not depict any of the plurality of hardware objects, the plurality of software objects, and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects.

For at least the reasons stated above, Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 44 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

Claims 45-47, 50, and 58 depend from independent claim 44 and, as such, incorporate all of the features of claim 44. Accordingly claims 45-47, 50, and 58 are allowable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claim 44. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 45-47, 50, and 58 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b).

#### D. Claim 59

Independent claim 59 recites:

59. A computer readable storage medium storing computer executable instructions that when executed on a processor manage a graphical interface, the medium storing:

instructions for providing a graphical interface, at least one hardware device and one software device being accessible through the graphical interface, the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware device or the software device;

instructions for providing a plurality of hardware objects accessible to the computer, where each of the hardware objects represents a hardware device and is depicted in the graphical interface, each hardware object configured to be interactive with the hardware device;

instructions for providing a plurality of software objects, each representative of a software device accessible to the computer, where each of the

software objects is depicted in the graphical interface and is configured to be interactive with the software device;

instructions for providing a plurality of configurations of the hardware object, each configuration allowing the user to edit at least one property of the hardware object;

*instructions for displaying the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one of the plurality of configurations of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously;*

*instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of a configuration from the plurality of configurations; and*

instructions for communicating with the hardware device corresponding to the selected configuration using the selected configuration.

Applicants respectfully submit that Johnson does not disclose at least *instructions for displaying the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one of the plurality of configurations of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*, which is present in claim 59. As noted above in relation to claim 44, Johnson does not show a plurality of hardware objects and a plurality of software objects and at least one of the plurality of configurations of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects in a single graphical interface simultaneously.

Further, Johnson does not disclose *instructions for receiving, from a user, a selection of a configuration from the plurality of configurations*. In Johnson, the user does not *select* from a plurality of configurations. Instead, a user *defines* a set of parameters for a terminal of the device.

Johnson does not disclose each and every feature of claim 59. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claim 59 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b).

## **II. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections.

### **A. Claims 7, 8, 12-14, 34, 35, 38, 48, 49 and 52**

Claims 7, 8, 12-14, 34, 35, 38, 48, 49 and 52 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0035008 to Fuller et al. (hereafter “Fuller”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 7, 8 and 12-14 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. As previously discussed in connection with claim 1, Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, or that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest the above-quoted features of claim 1. Fuller discusses a system and method for querying message-based instruments automatically and/or graphically parsing the responses, and generating code that encapsulates the connection/communication with the instrument and the parsing of the response (Fuller at paragraph [0019]). Fuller does not provide *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, but rather allows the user to enter only one configuration at a time. For example, Fuller at [0024] describes how “code may also be generated to call and execute the saved configuration.” This step allows a user to recall a single configuration for a device, and does not display more than one configuration simultaneously, which is present in claim 1.

Further, Fuller does not disclose or suggest that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*. Because Fuller does not allow a user to specify multiple configurations for a single device, Fuller does not represent each of the plurality of configurations with a unique hardware object.

Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 7, 8 and 12-14.

Claims 34, 35 and 38 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. As previously discussed, Johnson does not disclose or suggest *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. As in Johnson, Fuller describes a system in which a user enters a change to be applied to the hardware object or the software object at the interface, and then the hardware object or the software object is updated in response. (Fuller at paragraph [0021]). This is not the same as *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in a hardware or software object*, as required in claim 30. In fact, this is the opposite of what is recited in claim 30. In claim 30, the hardware or software object changes and the interface is updated in response. In Fuller, the user enters a change into the interface and the hardware device is updated in response to the change in the interface.

Thus Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 34, 35 and 38.

Claims 48, 49 and 52 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface*, which is present in claim 44.

Fuller also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Fuller, like Johnson, may display a list view of available devices, but does not display *the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface*. (Fuller at [0020]; *see also* Fuller at Figures 3-8).

Thus Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Fuller and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 48, 49 and 52.

## B. Claims 9 and 10

Claims 9 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0001896 to Hsiung et al. (hereafter “Hsiung”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

Hsiung also does not disclose or suggest these features. Hsiung discusses a technique for processing information or data over a network of computers.

Hsiung further discusses a system for monitoring and controlling a process, or both monitoring and controlling a process, [0007]. The system illustrated in Hsiung includes an input module for receiving a plurality of parameters from a process for manufacture of a substance or object.

Hsiung does not discuss configuring a hardware object or a software object, and therefore Hsiung does not discuss *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* or that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Thus Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 9 and 10.

### C. Claim 15

Claim 15 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Fuller and Hsiung. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Claim 15 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*

*simultaneously and that each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

As discussed above in II.A and II. B., Fuller and Hsiung each do not disclose or suggest this feature. Thus Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 15.

#### D. **Claims 16-17, 27, 39, 40, 43, 53 and 54**

Claims 16-17, 27, 39, 40, 43, 53 and 54 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0004670 to Schmit et al. (hereafter “Schmit”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Schmit discusses one or more measurement devices comprising a measurement hardware device, a virtual measurement device or other type of device. (Schmit at [0013]). Schmit further indicates that a graphical user interface presents a list of available devices and corresponding channels appropriate for the indicated measurement type, where each of the channels corresponds to a terminal of a corresponding device. (Schmit at [0016]). Schmit further indicates that if the selected measurement type were voltage, the devices listed may be those devices available to the system which are suitable for measuring a voltage. (Schmit at [0136]).

Claims 16, 17 and 27 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously and that each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest these features. Schmit does not allow for *a plurality of configurations* of a hardware object or a software object to be displayed *simultaneously*. (Schmit at [0013]). On the contrary, Schmit states “the purpose [of the configuration tool architecture] is to present the user with the ability to configure exactly what their application does ... and then build a single task that encompasses all of this information.”

(Schmit at [0240]). Schmit allows a user to specify a single configuration, and is not concerned with specifying a plurality of configurations. Accordingly, Schmit does not show a plurality of configurations simultaneously.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 16, 17 and 27.

Claims 39, 40 and 43 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson does not disclose or suggest ***the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object***, which is present in claim 30.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. As in Johnson and Fuller, Schmit describes a system in which a user enters a change to be applied to the hardware object or the software object at the interface, and then the hardware object or the software object is updated in response. (Fuller at [0013]). This is not the same as ***the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object***. In claim 30, the hardware or software object changes and the interface is updated in response. In Schmit, the user enters a change into the interface and the hardware device is updated in response to the change in the interface.

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 39, 40 and 43.

Claims 53 and 54 depend from claim 44 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson does not disclose or suggest ***a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously***, which is present in claim 44.

Schmit also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Like Johnson and Fuller, Schmit is concerned with actually configuring the measurement devices based on user input, and not displaying a device's potential configurations. (Schmit at [0013]). As a result, Schmit does not *display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously.*

Thus Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Schmit and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 53 and 54.

#### E. Claims 18-24, 26, 41, 42 and 55

Claims 18-24, 26, 41, 42 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of Hsiung, and U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0056018 to Pike et al. (hereafter “Pike”).

Claims 18-24 and 26 depend from claim 1 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously and that each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

Pike also does not disclose or suggest these features. In particular, Pike does not disclose or suggest *displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously, where each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Pike discusses receiving a first creation command from a user interface and establishing a communication channel linking the command interpreter and the control instrument independent of the interface bus or interface hardware driver type. (Pike at [0004]). Pike indicates a GUI that displays information regarding the configuration of the various communication channels the user may establish in response to user commands. (Pike at [0036]).

In contrast to claim 1, Pike states “the GUI 14 displays information regarding the configuration of the various communication channels the user 30 may establish in response to

user commands" (Pike at [0036]). This indicates that Pike displays a single configuration for each hardware or software device, and not a plurality of configurations, each configuration corresponding to *a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which is present in claim 1.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 18-24 and 26.

Claims 41 and 42 depend from claim 30 and, as such, include each and every feature of claim 30. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *the graphical interface being updated in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object*, which is present in claim 30.

Pike does not disclose or suggest this feature. Pike describes communicating with a device in order to configure it. (Pike at [0027]). Pike describes that the user enters configuration data and then communicates back and forth with the device in order to change the configuration of the device itself. Pike does not describe updating the graphical interface in response to a change in the hardware object or the software object, but rather updating the hardware object in response to a user command.

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 30. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claims 41 and 42.

Claim 55 depends from claim 44 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 44. Johnson and Hsiung do not disclose or suggest *a display device to display the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously*, which is present in claim 44.

Pike does not disclose or suggest this feature. Pike is concerned with establish *a* configuration of *a* device quickly and simply. (Pike at [0027]). Pike may list available devices (Pike at [0022]), but does not simultaneously show a configuration for any of those devices. Therefore, Pike does not display *the plurality of hardware objects and the plurality of software objects and at least one configuration of one of the hardware objects or one of the software objects to a user in a single graphical interface simultaneously.*

Thus Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 44. Therefore, Pike, Hsiung and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 55.

#### F. Claim 29

Claim 29 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious under Johnson in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,986,653 to Phathayakorn et al. (hereafter “Phathayakorn”). Claim 29 depends from claim 1 and, as such, includes each and every feature of claim 1. Johnson does not disclose or suggest *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously* and that *each configuration corresponds to a hardware object that represents the hardware device*, which are present in claim 1.

Phathayakorn discusses a method for signaling and acknowledging events associated with resource object organized in a foldable object tree displayed by a GUI. Phathayakorn further indicates that a foldable object tree allows a part of the tree to be folded into its parent object, (Col. 1, lines 55-60).

Phathayakorn also does not disclose or suggest this feature. Phathayakorn describes displaying data relating to signaling and acknowledging events associated with a resource object. (Phathayakorn at col. 1 lns. 55-60). Phathayakorn is concerned with the objects as they actually exist, not potential configurations that a user might want to select in the future. Therefore, Phathayakorn does not disclose *instructions for displaying the plurality of configurations simultaneously*, or that *each configuration corresponds to a unique hardware object that represents the hardware device*.

Thus Phathayakorn and Johnson, alone or in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 1. Therefore, Fuller, Hsiung and Phathayakorn in any reasonable combination, do not disclose or suggest each and every feature of claim 29.

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw the rejection of claims 7-10, 12-24, 26-27, 29, 34-35, 38-43, 48-49, and 52-55 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

**CONCLUSION**

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner feel that a teleconference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the Applicants' attorney at (617) 227-7400.

Please charge any shortage or credit any overpayment of fees to our Deposit Account No. 12-0080, under Order No. MWS-104. In the event that a petition for an extension of time is required to be submitted herewith, and the requisite petition does not accompany this response, the undersigned hereby petitions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136(a) for an extension of time for as many months as are required to render this submission timely. Any fee due is authorized to be charged to the aforementioned Deposit Account.

Dated: April 6, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Kevin J. Canning/  
Kevin J. Canning  
Registration No.: 35,470  
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
One Post Office Square  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109-2127  
(617) 227-7400  
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant